



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

as the French say, "children are what they are made," what can we expect in our civic life where children are left ignorant of the joys of fondling firearms? It was Terence who argued that "as each one wishes his children to be, so they are." Our book of quotations does not tell us the author of "Train up a child in the way he should go," so his name must be omitted; but there are many other quotations right here before us which we might make use of, all of which demonstrate that there is no hope of advancing civilization unless we begin with the impressionable little one. It would be easy to manufacture quotations such as "great marksmen from little snipers grow." But let it suffice here to say that our general impression is that the National Rifle Association may be said to be asleep at the switch, or target, or somewhere.

There are a few patriots who sense the seriousness of the situation. Senator Chamberlain, if he has his way, would have our boys begin, under compulsion of the State, to use the gun at the age of twelve. This is some improvement over the Rifle Association, but a boy is pretty well developed at twelve years of age. A number of our college presidents have discovered the importance of teaching the young idea how to shoot, and we are not of those who believe these presidents to be actuated by mercenary motives, hoping for Government grants. They are patriots, who are at last aware that, unless we all know how to shoot, this nation will be overrun by millions of Germans, British, French, and Bulgarians on our east, and by Japanese, Siamese, Russians, and Fiji Islanders west of the Rockies. All honor to Mayor Mitchel, of New York City, who now appoints no Commissioners of Education in that city unless they favor the military training of school children.

It may be added to the credit of the Christian ministers that many of them, awaking at last to the seriousness of the situation, and with that high effulgence of patriotic fervor so characteristic of some of the followers of Christ, are manfully attending our Plattsburgs, learning to shoot, and adding their share to the glory and security of our common country. When these simple followers of Christ prepare themselves unselfishly to blow a maximum number of holes through the warm flesh of a dastardly enemy from some land beyond the seas, are the rest of us going to continue forever our pusillanimous inactivity and our supine adherence to the mere policy of making a living and keeping out of jail? Aren't the other nations of the earth studying the high art of shooting? Why aren't we? Isn't it a well-known principle that any man unable to shoot invariably gets shot? Is not the time at hand, indeed, when every property owner should have a sixteen-inch gun at each corner of his lot?

Surely the war in Europe has demonstrated that the

only safe place for a man is in a trench. What is being done to provide this vital means of defense, the only security experience has to offer, for the cities and farm lands of this country? One can travel, we venture to say, from the Statue of Liberty to the Golden Gate, or from the copper mines of Michigan to the palmetto groves of Florida, and find not a single trench appropriate for any system of adequate defense. But this is another and merely a negative aspect of our problem. The positive duty, in this the greatest hour of human history, is, that in America every one should be taught to shoot, and shoot to kill—man, woman, and child.

MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION AT WORK

THE principle of compulsory arbitration was before the First Hague Conference, but it was not adopted. Many pacifists still argue for it as a remedy for the disease of war. The "*Ligue des Droits de l'Homme*," of France, at a congress referred to elsewhere in these columns, approved the principle of compulsory arbitration. The ADVOCATE OF PEACE holds that compulsory arbitration is a contradiction in terms. Arbitration by its very meaning implies a composition by free moral agents. An arbitration which has been compelled bids fair to be abrogated when once the power of compulsion has been lessened or removed. Our position is, therefore, that arbitration to be effective must be voluntary; and, where the element of force is absent, the arbitration is effective and permanent.

We have an illustration in this country of this important principle near at hand. It is found in the operations of the United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation. In this country, as in all countries, the relation of the employer to the employee is at the heart of the social problem. In the United States ten per cent of our men are employers, the rest employees. It has been demonstrated over and over again that in disputes between employers and employees judicial methods are inadequate, especially as regards friendly relations. Judges and the police are helpless in matters pertaining to wages, hours, and conditions of employment.

The operations of the United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation grew out of a law passed in 1898 which provided that disputes between employers and employees on interstate railroads should be referred to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to the Commissioner of Labor. The hope behind this act was that through mediation and conciliation the difficulties could be settled by arbitration. The success of the methods provided were so marked that, in 1913, by the passage of the Newlands law, the Board of Mediation and Conciliation came into being. While there are

250,000 miles of railroads in this country, with 2,000,000 employees, the fact is that strikes on the interstate railroads are negligible. This is true in spite of the fact that the mediators have no authority. In case of difficulties, sometimes the employees, sometimes the employers, sometimes both, apply to this board to use their offices for the composition of the disputes. The parties are never brought together. The decisions are made upon the free will of those concerned. The results have thus far invariably been agreeable. The board finds that in the majority of cases the employer wishes to be fair, the employee wishes to be fair, yet, in spite

of these facts, they find themselves wide apart as the poles. The question before the board comes at once, therefore, to be—What is right? By the methods which the board has found effective, the issues are defined, the problems clarified, and the difficulties settled. The board aims simply to represent the public interests, and asks continuously one question: How can this difficulty be settled? That the controversies are settled, and without any show of force, is one of the most encouraging social facts we know. Mediation and conciliation can be made to work. We know it, because by these methods they do work.

EDITORIAL NOTES

The American Institute of International Law at Havana.

The Second Annual Meeting of the American Institute of International Law was held in Havana, Cuba, beginning January 22. Projects relating to the fundamental bases of international law, of laws especially applicable to the American continent and relating to maritime neutrality, were presented to the institute by the general secretary, Alejandro Alvarez.

Expressing sincere regret that official duties prevented him from being present at the sessions of the institute "in which I am so deeply interested," and "to be a member of which is a distinguished honor," Mr. Lansing, Secretary of State, wrote among other things to the president of the institute, Dr. James Brown Scott, as follows:

"It will not be presumptuous, I trust, to call the attention of the members of the institute to the memorandum, which I had the honor to submit on January 3, 1916, at the first annual meeting, and which suggests the propriety of careful consideration of neutral rights and duties from the point of view of the neutrals. Though I realize that, during the continuance of the great international conflict in Europe, definite declarations should be avoided by the institute, the time would seem to be opportune, while concrete cases are in the minds of the members, to exchange views on the various phases of neutrality and possible means of alleviating in the future the burdens which grow more heavy and vexatious the longer the present state of war lasts. I hope that it may be found possible to do this, as I believe that it would result in the contribution of much valuable thought by men learned in the law of nations and qualified to solve the perplexing problems which are daily presented to those who are charged with the conduct of the foreign affairs of the American republics."

After a tribute to *Cuba Libre* and to the twentieth day of May, 1902, when the American flag was lowered and the American troops withdrew from "a sovereign,

free, and independent Cuba," President Scott, in his opening address, referred to the relations between Cuba and the United States, and said: "If the nations meet upon terms of equality and base their relations upon principles of justice, and if in good faith they keep the pledged word, we may expect peace. . . . We must think more of justice and the ways of peace, and less of force and the ways of war." The address then proceeded to consider "three things as indispensable." These are: We must "regard all nations as equals;" second, the relations of nations must "be based upon principles of justice;" third, the promises of nations, whether they be embodied in formal documents, such as treaties and conventions, or preserved in informal agreements, must "be scrupulously kept." President Scott then proceeded to lay before the institute for their approval and adoption the ten proposals set forth in his article, "The Organization of International Justice," which appeared in the January number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

By its adoption of the Rights and Duties of Nations at its meeting one year ago, the American Institute of International Law phrased the principles which constitute the point of departure for the nations in their upward climb toward a more rational intercourse. By urging the call of a Third Hague Conference, the stated meeting of The Hague Peace Conferences, the appointment of a committee to make possible the observance of its conventions and declarations, the creation of an international council of conciliation, the employment of good offices, mediation and friendly composition, the approval of the principle of arbitration, and the creation of the judicial union of the nations, the American Institute of International Law has now phrased the goal toward which the nations need most to strive, now and for a long hereafter.